

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks. Prior to entry of this response, Claims 1-15 and 18-20 were pending in the application, of which Claims 1 and 15 are independent. In the Office Action dated July 9, 2007, Claims 1-15 and 18-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Following this response, Claims 1-15 and 18-20 remain in this application. Applicant hereby addresses the Examiner's rejections in turn.

I. Interview Summary

Applicant thanks Examiner Chankong for the courtesy of a telephone interview on, September 14, 2007, requested by the undersigned to discuss the rejection of the current claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103. During the interview, Applicants asserted that the cited references do not render obvious the claims as currently amended. No agreement was reached regarding patentability. In addition, the Examiner stated he would inquire about having the proposed amendment faxed to him removed from the file wrapper as it was not a submission.

II. Rejection of the Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Office Action dated July 9, 2007, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-15 and 18-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,529,187 ("*Dickelman*") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,009,459 ("*Belfiore*") further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,847,959 ("*Arrouye*"). Claims 1 and 15 have been amended, and Applicant

respectfully submits that the amendments overcome this rejection and add no new matter.

Claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the reason that it recites, for example, "displaying, when it is determined that the one character of text does not comprise the single word, a string list in the web browser with a string list item wherein the string list item comprises a text string containing at least one instance of the character without regard to the location of the character within the text string." Independent Claim 15 includes a similar recitation. Support for these amendments can be found in the specification at least on page 2, lines 17-25.

In contrast, *Dickelman* at least does not teach or suggest the aforementioned recitation from Claim 1. For example, *Dickelman* discloses translating a key sequence to alphabetical characters for entering easily remembered sequences on a keyboard. (See col. 4, lines 16-19.) In *Dickelman*, letter combinations that are easily entered from a keypad are generated through a sequences selection of letters that corresponds to a first letter represented by a keyboard key. (See col. 4, lines 19-22.) For example, the "word" created by the key sequence is not meaningful, in and of itself. (See col. 4, lines 22-23.) However, in *Dickelman*, the importance lies not in the words themselves, but the sequence in the key navigation. (See col. 4, lines 23-25.) Accordingly, *Dickelman* merely discloses key sequences used to create words. Consequently, *Dickelman* does not teach or suggest displaying a string list item comprising a text string containing at least one instance of a character without regard to the location of the character within the text string. Rather *Dickelman* merely discloses creating words using specialized key sequences and is silent regarding displaying text strings including character instances.

In addition, *Belfiore* does not overcome *Dickelman's* deficiencies. *Belfiore* merely discloses initiating a search for a resource such as a web site when a user has specified (entered) text that is not a valid identifier for the resource, e.g., a uniform resource locator (URL). (See col. 2, lines 12-16.) In *Belfiore*, a heuristic analysis is employed to determine when text entered by the user is presented in the format of a valid identifier such as a URL. (See col. 2, lines 16-18.) When the entered text is determined to not have a valid URL format, the text may be placed in a template to identify/determine the meaning of the entered text. (See col. 2, lines 18-21.) Consequently, *Belfiore* merely discloses determining if entered text is a valid URL and, if not, placing the text in a template. Accordingly, like *Dickelman*, *Belfiore* at least does not teach or suggest displaying a string list item comprising a text string containing at least one instance of a character without regard to the location of the character within the text string. Rather *Belfiore* is silent regarding displaying text strings including instances of a character.

Furthermore, *Arrouye* does not overcome *Dickelman's* and *Belfiore's* deficiencies. *Arrouye* merely discloses an information retrieval system obtaining results and display them to a user in real time as the input is being entered. (See col. 6, lines 65-68.) In *Arrouye*, each keystroke or converted speech phoneme is provided to an appropriate plug-in module as it is received by a manager. (See col. 6, line 68-col. 7, line 2.) For example, if the user desires to look at prior tax return information, each of the letters "T", "A" and "X" are provided to the modules as they are typed. (See col. 7, lines 3-5.) As soon as the letter "T" is entered, sets of matching information items information are returned by the modules, and the top five candidates are displayed.

(See col. 7, lines 5-8.) Entry the letter "A" causes the list to be updated according to the candidates that match the letter sequence "TA" and after the letter "X" is typed, the displayed list might contain the five most recent tax returns that were filed by the user. (See col. 7, lines 8-12.) Consequently, *Arrouye* requires the text string to be entered in order beginning from a text string's first letter. Accordingly, like *Dickelman* and *Belfiore*, *Arrouye* at least does not teach or suggest displaying a string list item comprising a text string containing at least one instance of a character without regard to the location of the character within the text string. Rather *Arrouye* is dependent on a character's location within the text string and requires the first character to be entered when inputting text.

Combining *Dickelman* with *Belfiore* and *Arrouye* would not have led to the claimed invention because *Dickelman*, *Belfiore*, and *Arrouye*, either individually or in any reasonable combination, at least do not disclose or suggest displaying, when it is determined that the one character of text does not comprise the single word, a string list in the web browser with a string list item wherein the string list item comprises a text string containing at least one instance of the character without regard to the location of the character within the text string," as recited by amended Claim 1. Independent Claim 15 includes a similar recitation. Accordingly, independent Claims 1 and 15 each patentably distinguishes the present invention over the cited art, and Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection of Claims 1 and 15.

Dependent Claims 2-14 and 18-20 are also allowable at least for the reasons described above regarding independent Claims 1 and 15, and by virtue of their

respective dependencies upon independent Claims 1 and 15. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection of dependent Claims 2-14 and 18-20.

III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully requests the reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims. The preceding arguments are based only on the arguments in the Office Action, and therefore do not address patentable aspects of the invention that were not addressed by the Examiner in the Office Action. The claims may include other elements that are not shown, taught, or suggested by the cited art. Accordingly, the preceding argument in favor of patentability is advanced without prejudice to other bases of patentability. Furthermore, the Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicant declines to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this amendment and charge any additional required fees to our Deposit Account No. 13-2725.

Respectfully submitted,
MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.

P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903
404.954.5066

/D. Kent Stier/

Date: September 18, 2007

D. Kent Stier
Reg. No. 50,640

DKS:ARL:mdc

